

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Applicant appreciates the Examiners' willingness to allow a personal interview on June 15, 2005.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 10 have been amended, and new claims 17 and 18 have been added. Claim 9 was canceled in a previous amendment. Thus, claims 1-8 and 10-18 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

Interview Summary

Applicant's representative conducted an interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor on June 15, 2005. In the interview, it was agreed that amending claims 1 and 10 as amended herein would render claims 1 and 10 allowable over the cited art of record. Specifically, it was agreed that none of Katoh, Pape, Rambaldi and Tabei discloses or suggests at least the limitation of forming corrected image data for each pixel from the image sensor.

It was further agreed, during the interview, that amending claims 1 and 10 to include the limitation "wherein the delay circuit and the defect correction circuit process and output the image data in parallel" would render claims 1 and 10 allowable over the cited art of record. Specifically, it was agreed that none of Katoh, Pape, Rambaldi and Tabei discloses or suggests such a limitation.

Claims 1-8 and 10-16

In the Office Action dated February 10, 2005, claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katoh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,430, "Katoh") in view of Pape et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,047,863, "Pape"). The Examiner reasserted the rejections of claims 3, 5-6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katoh in view of Pape and further in view of Rambaldi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,084, "Rambaldi"), and claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katoh in view of Pape and further in view of Tabei (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,216). It is noted that claims 1 and 10 have been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, Applicant hereby traverses the rejections, as follows.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended as proposed by the Examiner in the interview of June 15, 2005. Specifically, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include the limitation "forming corrected image data for each pixel from the image sensor". As noted above, it was agreed during the interview of June 15, 2005, that this amendment of claims 1 and 10 would render claims 1 and 10 allowable over the cited art of record, as none of Katoh, Pape, Rambaldi and Tabei discloses or suggests such a feature. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 10, as amended, are patentably distinguished over the cited art of record, and in condition for allowance.

Each of claims 2-8 and 11-16 depends from claims 1 and 10, respectively. As such, each of these claims is allowable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 10, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-8 and 11-16 is respectfully requested.

New Claims 17 and 18

New claims 17 and 18 include the subject matter of claims 1 and 10, respectively, as amended to include the limitation "wherein the delay circuit and the defect correction circuit process and output the image data in parallel". As noted above, it was agreed in the interview of June 15, 2005, that amending claims 1 and 10 to include this limitation would render claims 1 and 10 allowable over the cited art of record, as none of Katoh, Pape, Rambaldi and Tabei discloses or suggests such a feature. Thus, Applicant submits that new claims 17 and 18 are patentably distinguished over the cited art of record. Accordingly, an early and favorable action on claims 17 and 18 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number **107317-00003**.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox, PLLC


Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

WC/MLC